1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
15	Plaintiff,	
16	ŕ	Case No. CR05-152RSL
17	v. LAM T. PHAM,	ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
18	Defendant.	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
19	Defendant.	
20	This matter comes before the Court on "Defendant Pham's Motion to Reconsideration"	
21	(Dkt. # 228). "Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such	
22	motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new	
23	facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable	
24	diligence." Local Rule CrR 12(c)(11)(A). Although defendant purports to allege new facts in	
25	his motion for reconsideration, he fails to show why these facts could not have been brought to	
26	ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR	
27		
28	RECONSIDERATION- 1	

Case 2:05-cr-00152-RSL Document 229 Filed 08/25/06 Page 1 of 2

the Court's attention in the previous motion. Moreover, the facts alleged by defendant in the instant motion contradict his sworn testimony at his plea hearing. See Dkt. # 218. For these reasons, defendant's motion for reconsideration is DENIED. DATED this 25th day of August, 2006. MMS Casnik
Robert S. Lasnik United States District Judge

ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION- 2